19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1	LEACH KERN GRUCHOW
2	ANDERSON SONG
_	SEAN L. ANDERSON
3	Nevada Bar No. 7259
	sanderson@lkglawfirm.com
4	RYAN D. HASTINGS
	Nevada Bar No. 12394
5	E-mail: <u>rhastings@lkglawfirm.com</u>
	2525 Box Canyon Drive
6	Las Vegas, Nevada 89128
7	Telephone: (702) 538-9074
7	Facsimile: (702) 538-9113
8	
	SQUIRE PATTON BOGGS (US) LLP
9	Gregory A. Davis (pro hac vice forthcoming)
	gregory.davis@squirepb.com
10	Gregory Schneider (pro hac vice forthcoming
	gregory.schneider@squirepb.com
11	1 East Washington Street, Suite 2700
12	Phoenix, Arizona 85004
12	Telephone: (602) 528-4000
13	Facsimile: (602) 253-8129
10	Attorneys for Financial Industry
14	Regulatory Authority, Inc.
15	UNITED STATE
16	
10	DISTRIC
17	

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

PEE PEE POP TRUST, PEE PEE POP
TRUST II, PEE PEE POP TRUST III, MAN

IN THE MATTER OF THE

CUB TRUST III, PEE PEE POP TRUST III, MAN CUB TRUST, MAN CUB TRUST II, MAN CUB TRUST III, DATED JULY 22, 2013. Case No.:

NOTICE OF REMOVAL

TO THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ <u>1331</u>, <u>1332</u>, <u>1367</u>, <u>1441</u>, and <u>1446</u>, Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, Inc. ("FINRA") hereby removes the above entitled action from the Second Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada in and for the County of Washoe, to this Court.

This case was filed by John Hurry as trustee of the Pee Pop Trust, Pee Pop Trust II, Pee

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Pee Pop Trust III, Man Cub Trust, Man Cub Trust II, and Man Cub Trust III, Dated July 22, 2013 (collectively, the "Trusts") in the Second Judicial District Court, Washoe County, Nevada (Case No. PR19-00231). The Trusts' causes of action all relate to the exercise of FINRA's regulatory oversight, and the application and enforcement of FINRA rules to its members in the exercise of FINRA's delegated authority under the federal securities laws. [See Petition to Assume Jurisdiction ("Petition") at 1–2, attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.]

FINRA files this Notice of Removal without prejudice to, and specifically reserves the right to, raise any jurisdictional arguments in the future as permitted by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. For the purposes of this Notice of Removal, the grounds for removal are as follows:

Statement of Jurisdiction

- 1. FINRA, previously known as the National Association of Securities Dealers, is a private not-for-profit Self-Regulatory Organization ("SRO"), which since 1939 has been the only registered national securities association in the United States. See <u>Turbeville v. FINRA</u>, 874 F.3d 1268, 1270 n.2 (11th Cir. 2017).
- 2. Plaintiffs are a series of Nevada trusts that own non-party broker dealers Scottsdale Capital Advisors Corporation ("SCA") and Alpine Securities Corporation ("Alpine"). SCA and Alpine are FINRA members.
- 3. As FINRA members, SCA and Alpine are subject to a comprehensive federal statutory plan for "cooperative regulation" of the securities market, "under which [SROs] . . . exercise a primary supervisory role subject to ultimate SEC control." See Sparta Surgical v. Nat'l Ass'n of Secs. Dealers, Inc., 159 F.3d 1209, 1211 (9th Cir. 1998). The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 requires FINRA to establish rules for its members "designed to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices, to promote just and equitable principles of trade, . . . and, in general, to protect investors and the public interest" 15 U.S.C. § 780-3(b)(6). FINRA is also required by the Exchange Act to "enforce compliance by its members and persons associated with its members," and to "appropriately discipline[]" such persons for violation of FINRA's rules or the Exchange Act. 15 U.S.C. § 780-3(b)(2), (7). Pursuant to the Securities

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Exchange Act of 1934, FINRA may initiate enforcement proceedings against members for violations of its rules, and final decisions in those proceedings are subject to an exclusive review process first by the Securities and Exchange Commission and ultimately a United States Court of Appeals. Scottsdale Capital Advisors Corp. v. FINRA, Inc., 844 F.3d 414, 418 (4th Cir. 2016).

- 4. A FINRA enforcement proceeding against SCA and Alpine that addresses the exact issue raised by the Trusts' petition—SCA and Alpine's failure to provide the trust documents to FINRA—is currently pending before FINRA, specifically FINRA disciplinary proceeding numbers FPI190001 and FPI190002 (STAR numbers 20190622633 and 20190622637). [See March 19, 2019 Notice of Suspension Pursuant to FINRA Rule 9552 to SCA ("SCA Suspension"), attached hereto as **Exhibit B**; March 19, 2019 Notice of Suspension Pursuant to FINRA Rule 9552 to Alpine ("Alpine Suspension"), attached hereto as **Exhibit C**; Order Rescheduling Hearing Date and Certain Pre-Hearing Deadlines, attached hereto as Exhibit **D**.1
- 5. Indeed, those proceedings are currently pending to determine if SCA's and Alpine's registration should be suspended for failure to produce documents related to the Trusts. [See SCA Suspension at 2–3 ("[Membership Application Program ('MAP')] specifically notified [SCA] that MAP will need to review the trust documents for all trusts referenced in [SCA's] letter [regarding the Man Cub Trust and Pee Pee Pop Trust] so that MAP could ascertain the ownership structure of the firm."); Alpine Suspension at 2-3 ("MAP specifically notified [Alpine] that MAP will need to review the trust documents for all trusts referenced in Alpine's letter [regarding the Man Cub Trust and Pee Pee Pop Trust] so that MAP could ascertain the ownership structure of the firm.").
- 6. A hearing date on FINRA's enforcement proceedings is currently set for June 18, 2019. Through this action, the Trusts are trying to undermine and circumvent those enforcement proceedings.
- 7. Indeed, the Trusts seek in their Petition (at 1) "an order that statutory 'Certifications of Trust in Lieu of Trust Instruments' . . . are sufficient proof of the existence and terms of the Trusts to satisfy the requirements for continued membership in FINRA, to enjoin

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

FINRA from terminating those memberships for failure to provide actual trust instruments and other information protected from disclosure" This is an issue in the underlying enforcement proceedings before FINRA.

- 8. The Trusts thus seek a judicial determination regarding FINRA's oversight authority under the Securities and Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 780-3, to regulate, admit, and demand information from its members.
- 9. The Trusts' requested relief is improper and cannot be decided as a matter of state law because federal law preempts state law jurisdiction over FINRA proceedings. See Sparta Surgical v. Nat'l Ass'n of Secs. Dealers, Inc., 159 F.3d 1209, 1211 (9th Cir. 1998) ("Because [plaintiff's] complaint sought relief based upon violation of exchange rules, subject matter jurisdiction was specifically [and exclusively] vested in the federal district court under the Exchange Act "). Indeed, federal law provides that "[t]he district courts of the United States and the United States Courts of any territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States shall have exclusive jurisdiction of violations of this chapter or the rules and regulations thereunder, and of all suits in equity and actions at law brought to enforce any liability or duty created by this chapter or the rules and regulations thereunder." 15 U.S.C. § 78aa (emphasis added); Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v. Epstein, 516 U.S. 367, 370 (1996) (section 78aa of the Exchange Act "confers exclusive jurisdiction upon the federal courts for suits brought to enforce the Act or rules and regulations promulgated thereunder"). Accordingly, this Court has original subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because the Trusts' claim regarding FINRA's application of its rules arises under the laws of the United States.
- 10. The Trusts also seek a declaratory judgment regarding their obligations to disclose trust documents under Nevada law. [Petition at 1–2.] This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over the Trusts' declaratory judgment claim because it is so related to the Trusts' claim regarding FINRA's regulatory actions that it forms "part of the same case or controversy under Article III of the United States Constitution." See 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a).
 - This Court also has jurisdiction over this action pursuant 28 U.S.C. § 1332 11.

because the Trusts (all Nevada entities) are diverse from FINRA, a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in Washington, District of Columbia. The amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000 because the Trusts allege that failure to enjoin FINRA will result in a "total loss of their business[es]," which, upon information and belief, are valued at significantly more than \$75,000.

Venue

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

12. The United States District Court for the District of Nevada is the proper place to file this Notice of Removal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a) because this district and division embraces Washoe County, Nevada, in which this action was filed and is pending.

Timeliness of Removal

13. Removal of this action to this Court is timely under 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b)(1) because this Notice of Removal is filed within 30 days after FINRA first received a copy of the Trusts' petition, which was mailed to FINRA's statutory agent for service and received on May 3, 2019. [See Letter to FINRA from CSC, a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit E.]

Pleadings, Process, Orders, and Notice

- 14. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(a), a copy of all process, pleadings, and orders served upon, or otherwise received by, FINRA are attached hereto as **Exhibit F**.
- 15. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d), a copy of this Notice of Removal will be filed with the Clerk of the Second Judicial District Court of Washoe County, Nevada promptly after the filing of this Notice of Removal. This Notice of Removal will also contemporaneously be served on the Trusts by mail and email.

23

. . .

24 . . .

25

26 . . .

27 . . .

28

Case 3:19-cv-00240-MMD-CBC Document 1 Filed 05/09/19 Page 6 of 7

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28

WHEREFORE, FINRA respectfully requests that this Court assume full jurisdiction over
this action now pending in the Second Judicial District Court of Washoe County, Nevada (Case
No. R19-00231), and that this action be removed to the United States District Court for the
District of Nevada.

Dated this 9th day of May, 2019.

LEACH KERN GRUCHOW ANDERSON SONG

/s/ Sean L. Anderson

Sean L. Anderson Nevada Bar No. 7259 Ryan D. Hastings Nevada Bar No. 12394 2525 Box Canyon Drive Las Vegas, Nevada 89128

LEACH KERN GRUCHOW ANDERSON SONG

Case 3:19-cv-00240-MMD-CBC Document 1 Filed 05/09/19 Page 7 of 7

LEACH KERN GRUCHOW ANDERSON SONG 2525 Box Canyon Drive, Las Vegas, Nevada 89128 Telephone: (702) 538-9074 – Facsimile (702) 538-9113

Pursuant to FRCP 5(b), the undersigned, an employee of LEACH KERN GRUCHOW
ANDERSON SONG, hereby certifies that on the 9th day of May, 2019, a copy of the foregoing
NOTICE OF REMOVAL was electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court for the United
States District Court by using the Court's EM/ECF system and served through the Court's Notice
of electronic filing system automatically generated to those parties registered on the Court's
Master E-Service List as follows:

William E. Peterson (wpeterson@swlaw.com) Janine C. Prupas (jprupas@swlaw.com) SNELL & WILMER L.L.P. 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 510 Reno, Nevada 89501

/s/ Robin Callaway

An Employee of LEACH KERN GRUCHOW ANDERSON SONG